

REMARKS

Claims 8-23 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kalmanek, Jr. et al.* (US 6,694,429). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 8 (and similarly Claim 16) recites a step of "sending a reservation request for a virtual connection from said source workstation to a reservation server, wherein said reservation server includes connection setup means for setting up a virtual connection that meets a predefined Quality of Service (QoS) requirement from said ingress node to said egress node." On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed sending step is disclosed by *Kalmanek* in col. 6, lines 47-62, and that the claimed setting up of a virtual connection that meets a predefined QoS requirement is disclosed by *Kalmanek* in col. 9, lines 18-34.

The Examiner characterizes *Kalmanek's* gate controllers 110 and/or 111 as the claimed reservation server. In col. 6, lines 59-62, *Kalmanek* explains that "upon receiving a setup request message from a calling party, the gate controller can authenticate the identity of the calling party and authorize the service sought by the calling party." However, the claimed virtual connection is not part of *Kalmanek's* setup request message. At least, *Kalmanek* does not explicitly mention the setup request message includes the claimed reservation request for a virtual connection.

In addition, *Kalmanek's* gate controllers do not include "connection setup means for setting up a virtual connection that meets a predefined Quality of Service (QoS) requirement from said ingress node to said egress node," as claimed. Col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* defines the term "quality of service" as used by *Kalmanek*, which is specifically related to "the calling party and/or the called party specify a quality of service for the call and service provider can verify the specified quality of service for the call" (col. 9, lines 24-27). Hence, the term "quality of service" as used by *Kalmanek* does not contemplate the predefined QoS requirement from an ingress node

to an egress node offered by the claimed connection setup means within the claimed reservation server when setting up a virtual connection.

Claim 8 also recites a step of "determining whether or not said reservation request can be validated based on user information within said source workstation, wherein said user information is accessible by said reservation server." The Examiner asserts that the claimed determining step is disclosed by *Kalmanek* in col. 9, lines 18-34.

As mentioned above, col. 9, lines 18-27 of *Kalmanek* defines the term "quality of service" as used by *Kalmanek*, and col. 9, lines 27-34 of *Kalmanek* provides an example related to "the calling party and/or the called party specify a quality of service for the call and service provider can verify the specified quality of service for the call." Thus, col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* does not teach or suggest the validation of a reservation request based on user information within the source workstation, as claimed.

In addition, since the claimed determining step is related to the determination of whether or not a reservation request can be validated based on user information within a source workstation, if col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* teaches the claimed determining step, col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* has to mention the claimed reservation request (or *Kalmanek*'s set up request message). However, *Kalmanek*'s set up request message was not mentioned in col. 9, lines 18-34 at all. Thus, it is clear that col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* does not teach or suggest the claimed determining step.

Because Claim 8 recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Kalmanek*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 8-23 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 8 and 16 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS